DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 139 EA 013 168

TITLE Guidelines for Selected Personnel Practices in Catholic Schools, II.
INSTITUTION National Catholic Educational Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 76
NOTE 63p.: For a related document, see ED 169 632.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Sales, National Catholic Educational Assn., One Dupont Circle, Suite 350, Washington, DC 20036 ($3.75 prepaid; quantity discounts)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Selection; *Catholic Schools; Contracts; Evaluation Criteria; Nuns; *Personnel Policy; Priests; Principals; *Religious Education; *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

The five papers in this volume are directed to Catholic educators. The first paper discusses the practical problems of organizing and implementing a successful retreat program for high school students. The second paper concerns the complex process of developing effective teacher evaluation instruments. It presents a survey of the literature on teacher evaluation with respect to the development of an evaluation instrument. It also reports the results of applying principles derived from the literature survey to the actual development of a teacher evaluation instrument. The third article considers ways of perceiving the various roles in a Catholic school, as well as some procedures, structures, and methods. The fourth article discusses contracts in educational ministry. The final paper describes the job of a search committee formed to select a superintendent of schools for the Archdiocese of Baltimore (Maryland). (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196139

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Guidelines for Selected Personnel Practices in Catholic Schools II

EA 013 168

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NCEA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

NCEA

NATIONAL CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Most Rev. Cletus F. O'Donnell, Chairman
Rev. John F. Meyers, President

Msgr. John F. Murphy	College and University Department
Rev. James B. Sullivan	Seminary Department
Msgr. Francis X. Barrett	Chief Administrators Department
Bro. John D. Olsen, C.F.X.	Secondary School Department
Sr. Kathleen Short, O.P.	Elementary School Department
Rev. Alfred McBride, O.Praem.	National Forum of Religious Educators
Dr. Mary-Angela Harper	National Assn. of Boards of Education
Sr. Elinor Ford, O.P.	National Forum of Catholic Parent Organizations
Bro. Ricardo Kerressey, C.F.X.	Development Office
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Elmer H. Behrmann	Special Education Department
Joseph O'Donnell	Vice President for Business Affairs
Mrs. Rhoda Goldstein	Director of Membership/Data Bank
Carl Balcerak	Director of Communication
Sr. Veronica Grover, S.H.C.J.	Justice Education

Copies of this publication may be obtained by writing:

Publication Sales
National Catholic Educational Association
One Dupont Circle, Suite 350
Washington, D. C. 20036

Prepaid prices of publication, including postage and mailing charges:

1-9 copies $3.75 per copy

On orders of $25.00 or more there is a five percent discount up to $50.00. On $50.00 or more there is a ten percent discount.

Introduction

In May of 1975 the CACE Department and the Secondary Department of NCEA cooperated in the publication of the first volume of Guidelines for Selected Personnel Practices in Catholic Schools. Articles appearing in this publication included preparations from the Committee on Personnel of the Supervision, Personnel and Curriculum Section of the Department of Chief Administrators of Catholic Education, NCEA.

It would seem the articles in this first volume touch on a number of key concerns of Catholic educators since the response to the publication was overwhelming and it was necessary for it to be reprinted several times.

This second volume attempts to treat subjects not included in our first publication. Though more voluminous in content, this new publication does not pretend to cover all of the issues of concern to Catholic educators. It is our hope, however, that it does expand the treatments of the first publication and touches on some new and critical issues in our schools.

An obvious omission is the matter of collective bargaining and unionism in Catholic schools. We have on hand such extensive material in this area that it is necessary for us to develop it into a separate publication.

Special gratitude goes to the various authors contained. Some of them came to us unsolicited and expressed a keen interest on the part of the author.

Bro. John D. Olsen, C.F.X.
Rev. Msgr. Francis X. Barrett
NCEA, December 1976

NOV 3 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Building Faith-Community With a Closed Retreat: A Model High School Program	1
Teacher Evaluation: A Study in a Process-Product	9
Roles and Structures for Contemporary Catholic Education	27
Contracts in Educational Ministry	40
The Superintendent's Search Became a 90-Day Wonder	50

Building Faith-Community With a Closed Retreat: A Model High School Program

by

Ronald J. Cook and Rev. Ben Markwell

"Catholic education is an expression of the mission entrusted by Jesus to the church He founded." Of the many educational programs available the Catholic schools afford the "fullest and best" method of reaching the triple goals of teaching doctrine, building community, and serving others enumerated by the American Bishops in their 1972 pastoral, To Teach As Jesus Did.

The Need for Practical Suggestions

The three-fold goals represent a set of ideals toward which school administrators strive Practical assistance toward bringing them to fruition is what administrators yearn for. Giving Form to the Vision, published by NCEA in 1974, was most helpful by providing a process to help administrators work with their staff to internalize and implement the three-fold goals. But beyond this there is still a need to assist administrators with solid, practical, nuts and bolts suggestions and ideas across a broad spectrum of programs. This paper represents an attempt by two Catholic educators, one a high school principal and the other a retreat house director, to come to grips with the very practical problems of organizing and implementing a su[illegible]sful retreat program for

---

Ronald J. Cook is Principal of Bishop Foley High School in Madison Heights, Michigan and Father Ben Markwell is Retreat Master at Christian Friendship House in St. Clair, Michigan.

high school students. A search of the literature reveals very little on this subject. The authors will briefly examine the unique characteristics of their separate institutions and then discuss the mechanics of a successful retreat program which could serve as a model for other educators.

Dynamics of the High School Program

The religion department of the modern Catholic high school is really the hub of the school. Here the practical and theoretical aspects of teaching doctrine, building community, and serving others must find expression. Sound pedagogy requires the religion staff be familiar with developmental characteristics of teenagers, especially regarding the inculcation of values. Gradually throughout the high school years students are asserting and developing their own value system. Ideas are tested within the peer group. There is a developing interest in ethical and religious problems. There is a growing understanding of ethical abstractions such as "justice." A perception of the contradictions in moral codes emerges. Social issues arise and are discussed within the peer group. Group beliefs become important in influencing the emerging value structure. By the senior year there has usually been an integration of values into a personal philosophy of life. Ethical and moral standards have reached a high degree of development. An idealism has developed. The student has often made a permanent, even life long, commitment to causes.

These are formative years, filled with those "pregnant moments" when an intelligent, sensitive, teacher can touch a student in a profound way with a well turned phrase, a telling question, or the right quotation, just as Jesus touched His own disciples. The students are

energetic and activity oriented. A retreat program, well organized and with clear goals in mind can compliment the formal high school religious education program at these formative times. The retreat masters, well versed in group dynamics and adolescent psychology, serve as teachers in much the same way as the school staff. They arouse the mind, stimulate the development of consciousness, and along with the regular high school staff serve as models of responsible, caring, loving adult Christians.

Transmission of Faith

FAITH for modern man is a reality far different today than at any other time in recent history. In previous times faith was transmitted through tradition, through the structures of the Church, through significant others. In buying into Chruch structure one "accepted faith." More accurately, "accepted the faith." Being a believer, for the most part, involved believing (accepting) the doctrines of the Church and living in obedience to the Church's teachings.

Today, faith is a much more personal "experience." Personalized faith is not transmitted through previous modes but through an experience of meeting and encountering the Lord. Faith today is not the acceptance of a body of truth about the Lord. It is the acceptance, on a deep personal level, of Jesus Christ as the Son of God, a personal Savior, Who alone brings one into relationship with the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Today's generation of young people, brought up in an audio-visual, tactile world, tend to discount what they cannot touch, taste or see. Thus, "faith experiences" take on greater importance. Commitment to

Jesus as Lord flows not from the acceptance of creeds or doctrines but in the experiential encounter with the Lord.

Teaching about faith is not necessarily sharing faith; anymore than knowing about a person means knowing the person. Catholic high schools are realizing the value of centers away from the academic setting to provide for just such faith experiences. Thus is born the center for student retreats.

Retreat House Dynamics

Christian Friendship House is the only full-time youth center in the Archdiocese of Detroit and one of the very few throughout the country which conducts retreat programs exclusively for high school and college-age students. The staff at Friendship House is aware that ordinarily the parish or the Catholic high school cannot provide "peak" religious experiences which make faith personal. The staff accepts that man first meets God in and through his fellow man. In the daily human encounters among parents, teachers and fellow students one catches glimpses of God Himself. However, "glimpses of God" are not sufficient to develop or sustain religious faith. Personal faith is built on, although not centered on, faith experiences.

Faith experience, in order to be genuine, must begin where the person is at. To talk about committing oneself to God on a deep interpersonal level makes no sense to a student who doesn't like himself or is afraid of relating meaningfully with his peers. Man relates as deeply to God as he does to his most intimate friends.

Thrust of the Retreat Program

The retreat program at Friendship House has three areas of emphasis:

1. To develop or deepen in the student an attitude of OK-ness. Vatican II reminds us that "man is more precious for what he IS than for what he can do." Experience in the Retreat movement tells us that this is an area of great concern. The typical student today simply does not believe in the uniqueness of the gift that he or she is. Personal affirmation from significant adults and peers is needed to initiate and foster that aspect of the growth process. Being called by one's proper name is the simplest beginning point. The wearing of name tags takes on great importance.

   At times students are reluctant to speak before the whole group. Many times gentle but firm insistence on the uniqueness of their personal contribution challenges the student to new growth in self-expression. The same is true in inviting students to read aloud at liturgy or to share a spontaneous prayer before or after meals. The challenge to growth would be stymied if the staff would accept the student's "no" as their final response.

   Consistency of response is important too in aiding a student to discover that he or she really is OK. Practically that means a smile, a warm greeting, a friendly glance.

2. To deepen knowledge and appreciation of fellow students. High school students who have chummed around together for four years oftentimes know little about each other. Frequently on retreats one hears, "I thought I knew you; but today, for the first time, I feel like I have just met you."

   Modern man is plagued with the horrible sense of alienation precisely as he is part of the burgeoning crowd. Jesus, in calling us to Himself, is inviting us to go beyond the loneliness of isolation by involvement in faith in community.

   Profession of faith is not simply professing that Jesus is Lord. It also involves growth in relationship to the community of believers. Through Baptism one is initiated into the community of faith. Entering into that community can overcome the loneliness; and feedback from peers deepends one's sense of self-worth.

3. To deepen one's awareness and appreciation for God. Man finds his ultimate happiness and reason for being in God. Existential philosophers like Sartre describe the loneliness and emptiness that modern man experiences. That emptiness and loneliness which reminds us that there is more to life than what we can taste, touch and see. As St. Augustine said so long ago: "Our hearts are restless until they rest in Thee."

   The divine-human embrace is a process of growth in relationship much as one friend to another. Thus, many elements of our program have to do with developing communication between

the students. However, there is a strong Christological emphasis to our program: a daily Eucharistic liturgy, a communal penance service, morning prayer, prayer before and after meals, and a special meditation period.

High School Expectations

The high school administrator would expect the retreat program to compliment the daily religious studies program. It should attempt to reach the student at their level of faith in addition to being a community building experience. It is not simply a fun weekend, though it should, of course, be a pleasant experience. variety of teaching methods and experiences should be incorporated, including lectures, small group discussions, Q&A periods, recreational activities, and opportunities to participate in the sacraments. An informal setting is conducive to securing a high degree of student participation. There should be an attempt to create an atmosphere conducive to reaching the goals of the retreat program.

Retreat House Expectations

The retreat center presumes that the school has adequately prepared the students with a realistic expectation of the specific retreat program being provided; that the students are open to participation in and cooperation with the goals and methods of the program in contrast to presuming to do one's own thing.

A successful retreat program requires mutual respect and close cooperation between retreat center and the Catholic high school. The retreat center is not established for its own sake, to do its own thing. It exists to assist the high school in the religious formation and development of its students. There cannot be a sense of competition between retreat center and high school, a vying for the loyalties or

affections of the students. An appreciation of the joint task, undertaken in different modes of the Christian formation of the student is essential.

Checklist for a Successful High School Retreat

The following set of items is suggested as a checklist for administrators in organizing the retreat program:

1. The school administrator should make a commitment to develop a retreat program which compliments the religious studies curriculum.
2. Retreats should be optional.
3. There should be personal contact between school and retreat house.
4. There should be personal contact between retreat master and student body prior to retreat itself.
5. Publicize the program prior to the retreat. Emphasize the positive in discussions with parents, staff and students.
6. The parents and students should be helped to form a set of realistic expectations from the retreat program.
7. Supervision adequate. Not necessarily just order but ongoing school staff process.
8. Verbalize high expectations in student behavior.
9. Use school staff for resource people on retreat.
10. Try to schedule early in the year in order to enjoy its benefits.
11. Retreats should be away from school setting if possible.
12. Evaluate the program at its conclusion. Seek feedback from students, parents and staff.
13. Be willing to modify in accordance with the evaluation results.
14. Follow up periodically so that the retreat experience is not seen as an isolated event but is integrated into the life of the high school faith community.

Advantages to the Student

The dynamics of the "closed" retreat affords the student a healthy growth in intimacy with fellow students and staff which results in the deepening of friendships and the consequent growth in self-confidence. Within the small group (25 to 35 students), there is the openness to greater risk-taking and sharing that occasions development of existing relationships. This, in turn, prepares the student for that deepest of interpersonal relationships: that meeting with Christ in the quiet of his/her own inner self.

Advantages to the High School

1. Creation of an improved spirit of community among students and staff.
2. Improvement in attitude of participants which spills over into all aspects of school life.
3. Positive modifications of student behavior can result from successful retreat experience.
4. Curriculum is enhanced if retreat program is incorporated fully into religious studies department.
5. Quality retreat program provides evidence the school is meeting its commitment to build community, teach doctrine, serve others.
6. Successful program serves as a model and motivates others to participate.

Summary

The first draft of the National Catechetical Directory has this to say regarding retreats:

> (They) impart a vision of Christian life that can spark enthusiasm and provide the occasion for the acceptance that young persons seek and need. Those conducting these programs must continue to be properly trained and experienced in prayer, spiritual growth, group work, and counseling.

Teacher Evaluation: A Study in a Process-Product

by

Sandra N. Smith

One of the critical needs in Catholic education is the development and implementation of a system of teacher evaluation. Americans in general have become increasingly sensitive to the efficiency of their institutions, including the schools. Teacher accountability has many supporters in secular education. With Catholic schools in a condition of increasing financial stringency, with schools closing, it seems essential that each Catholic school system develop a program of teacher evaluation. Koob and Shaw have remarked that while there is "still a receptive clientele for Catholic schooling, . . . its attitude is no longer uncritical."[1]

The purpose of this article is to stimulate interest among elementary and secondary school teachers, principals, superintendents, and board members in the complex process of developing effective teacher evaluation instruments. It presents a survey of the literature on teacher evaluation with respect to issues as they relate to the process of client-centered and client-directed development of an evaluation instrument. It also reports the results of applying principals derived from the literature survey to the actual development of a teacher evaluation instrument.

Sandra Smith is an Associate Professor of Education at Howard University.

[1] C. Albert Koob, O.Praem. and Russell Shaw, S.O.S. for Catholic Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970, p. 7.

During the Fall 1974, I was on sabbatical leave from my university duties and spent the semester assisting the Catholic Office of Education, Archdiocese of Washington, in developing an instrument for the evaluation of teachers. Although the elementary school principals had been doing evaluations of teachers routinely, the basis for the evaluations varied widely from classroom visitation to occasional hall observations. A series of workshops was held with principals and teachers in which an instrument was developed, copyrighted and recommended for use during the 1975 academic year.

Criteria for Implementing an Evaluation Process

In considering criteria for implementing an evaluation process, the literature identifies several concepts that are considered important.

1. All persons who are to be affected by the process, the evaluator and the evaluatee, are critical components to its planning and development, as well as to its adoption and its continued testing and improvement. Staynor Brighton states, "Involving teachers is the most essential factor in the success or failure of a teacher evaluation program."[1] With this in mind, a plan was designed to involve principals, and teachers to as great a degree as possible. After initial, formal presentations on the theory of teacher evaluation, based on a survey of the literature and the distribution of reading materials to the principals prior to the sessions, discussions were held on the methods of evaluation currently being employed in the various Archdiocesan schools. At subsequent sessions, existing instruments used in public and parochial schools were examined and critically analyzed. Concurrently, workshops were held for teachers; various concepts of teacher evaluation were discussed and their critiques of a sampling of evaluation instruments were elicited.

2. Effective evaluation processes are predicated upon the open discussion of and agreement upon objectives to be achieved in a school system, the particular school and/or the individual classroom.

---

[1]Staynor Brighton, Increasing Your Accuracy in Teacher Evaluation, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1965, p. 36.

3. Further, any evaluation process should be broadly enough to involve examination of the entire process rather than simply the teacher in the classroom. That is, it should consider all other inputs in addition to teacher activity that have a bearing upon outcomes.

4. Additionally, any teacher evaluation process should provide for the assessment of student outcomes and also those teacher activities which seem most related to student outcomes. Principals may indeed prefer that teachers behave in certain ways, but those behaviors may not be related to achieving specified student outcomes.

5. Finally, the criteria used in assessing teacher effectiveness should be openly arrived at, supported by empirical research or by sound logical reasoning, and clearly defined so that teachers - and indeed all persons concerned with evaluation - will have the highest level of confidence in the soundness of the criteria.

In the light of these process criteria, a preliminary draft of an instrument was developed by the author, based on professional study and input from the principals, recorded on tape, and from the teachers who participated in the workshops. This draft was critically examined by the professional staff of the Catholic Office of Education. Subsequently, the revised instrument was distributed to community supervisors, principals, and to the 1,500 elementary school teachers in the Archdiocese of Washington for analysis and criticism. The revision was distributed to the principals for voluntary implementation during May-June 1975.

What is Evaluation?

As the concept of teacher evaluation was discussed in the workshops with principals and teachers, it became evident that evaluation should be distinguished from observation. Careful observation of teaching, sometimes called "assessment," is simply an objective or descriptive term referring to a non-valuational description. Frustration with

efforts to find valid criteria of teaching effectiveness has resulted in the feeling among many researchers that much more observation of teaching needs to be done before sound evaluation can be developed. Thus, within the last decade or so, systems for observing the teaching process have proliferated. Persons who are not close to the research process often confuse these observation systems with evaluation.

How is evaluation different from observation? Evaluation is the attachment of some judgment respecting the merit or worth of that which has been observed.[1] Carter V. Good says evaluation is "the consideration of evidence in the light of value standards and in terms of the particular situation and the goals which the group or individual is striving to attain."[2] This definition not only emphasizes the role of value judgments as the factor distinguishing observation from evaluation, but also points out the ground or source of those value judgments. One usually derives the value judgments which operate in educational evaluation from one's purposes or goals. Robert B. Howsam points out that:

> Evaluation is always concerned with usefulness. We evaluate items in any category of things on the basis of the extent to which they are useful means to recognized ends. . . . When the evidence, as perceived and interpreted, is that observed teaching accords with one's values and leads to achievement of recognized and accepted goals, it will be approved and favorably rated.[3]

This definition implies several things. It means, for example, that

---

[1] W. James Popham, "Designing Teacher Evaluation Systems," Los Angeles, Cal: Instructional Objectives Exchange, 1971, p. 6. ED 070 716.

[2] Carter V. Good (ed.), "Evaluation," Dictionary of Education, New York: McGraw Hill, 1973, p. 220.

[3] Robert B. Howsam, "Teacher Evaluation: Facts and Folklore," The National Elementary School Principal, November, 1963, p. 8.

no process of evaluation is sound which does not take into consideration the goals of the school system, the goals of the school, and the goals which the individual teacher has set. Again, Howsam's remarks are to the point:

> The process of evaluation should involve careful attention to teacher behavior as the means to identified and desirable ends. In practice, isolated qualities and characteristics are often rated without regard to means, ends, or particular situations. This is dangerous in that it tends toward stereotyped thinking, and to conformity pressures in areas that may not be related to competence or effectiveness.[1]

This definition of evaluation also emphasizes the necessity of developing specific evaluation processes for Catholic schools. Several opposing pressures are at work in this regard. Schools with a religious orientation are anxious to deminstrate that this orientation does not lead to second rate academic achievement. Thus, the temptation is to use the same criteria for teacher evaluation for all schools indiscriminately. The weakness is obvious: the underlying values and objectives are not the same. Many educational institutions, e.g., private, religious oriented schools, have values that are central to curriculum formation and teacher selectivity and performance. On the other hand, since religious objectives are difficult to define and measure operationally, there is a temptation to retreat into evaluative methods which are mainly subjective or rational, but which lack experimental or empirical support. These competing pressures must be creatively resolved by Catholic schools into evaluation systems which reflect the unique set of values and goals characteristic of these schools. These conflicting pressures were all observed as the principals and teachers were challenged to define and incorporate into the instrument those criteria which would reflect the objectives which define a Catholic school system.

---

[1] Ibid.

The Process of Evaluation

The definitions we have just considered make it evident that evaluation is not an isolated activity. It has antecedents and consequents. It is one step in a system or process.

Evaluation begins with the determination of educational goals. It is from these that the value judgments arise that are crucial in evaluation. Educational goals are multiple and varied, ranging from goals in the cognitive area, in the affective area, and in the skill or psychomotor area, to employ Bloom's categories. Koob and Shaw point out that the goals of producing a "good Catholic" and a "good citizen" have been redefined to embrace the "training of revolutionaries, men who are remade in and by Christ, and who then go on, through peaceful means, to remake society."[1]

A second stage in the process is research to determine effective ways to achieve the goals which have been earlier identified. Many evaluators, such as school principals or supervisors, trust to intuition or guess work as a basis for deciding what practices are most effective in achieving specific goals. The research ingredient is usually the weakest link in the whole process. Not only is there little or no research respecting the kinds of goals mentioned above, but the technical problems involved in designing such research are formidable indeed.

Out of research, then, should come a set of evaluative criteria for effective teaching that are appropriate in the particular situation being evaluated. These criteria are then used as the basis for making observations of the teaching process. After observations are made and evaluated using the criteria provided by research, the evaluation is then employed

---

[1] Koob and Shaw, op cit., p. 131.

in whatever ways are appropriate. Perhaps, for example, it may become the basis for in-service programs to assist teachers improve the degree to which they are reaching their objectives. Following such in-service programs, revisions of the teaching process may be made. Additional observations and evaluations of the revised process may be made, and so the process continues. From time to time, the evaluative criteria would be modified as further research might suggest.

Therefore, it is evident that evaluation has many facets; it is not a simple, isolated act. Evaluation requires a sound basis in scientific research to the degree that it is possible and available rather than being based on hunch, on stereotyped thinking, or private intuition. Finally, it must not be viewed as an end in itself, but should feed into the educational process and influence it.

Purposes of Evaluation

As complex as the process of evaluation is, and as sensitive as it is, one might well ask, "Why evaluate?" What purposes are to be served by evaluation? Intuitively, we can all sense that evaluation is a natural, inevitable, indispensable activity. Anyone who sets goals for himself, then plans activities designed to reach those goals, will naturally seek to check the extent to which these goals have been reached. Unless one has no concern to learn whether his goals are being reached, evaluation is natural and inescapable. Koob and Shaw make the cogent observation that the effectiveness and desirability of Catholic education have traditionally been assumed, not demonstrated by careful evaluation.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 19.

Donald Musella identified two major purposes for evaluation. First, there are certain institutional purposes or needs to be served. Second, there is the improvement of instruction, a purpose which serves both the teacher and the institution. In the first, or institutional category, Musella lists such uses as the decision for retention or promotion of teachers, merit pay, and similar administrative uses.[1]

Robert Howsam listed eight purposes to be served by teacher evaluation: (1) to determine the effectiveness of personnel policies and procedures; (2) to determine the effectiveness of the instructional program; (3) to provide the basis for supervisory and in service development of programs and activities; (4) to provide the basis for administrative decisions; (5) to facilitate accounting for responsibility; (6) to motivate teachers to strive for a high level of performance; (7) to provide the basis for rewards and sanctions; and (8) to assist the teacher in achieving success.[2]

To the above, Bolton would add: (1) to gather information for the modification of teacher assignments; (2) to promote self-improvement for the teacher; and (3) to protect the teacher and the organization from a legal point of view.[3]

Although the ranking by importance of these purposes for evaluation would depend upon the situation, one stands out preeminently above others. The paramount reason for any program of evaluation must be the

---

[1] Donald Musella, "Improving Teacher Evaluation," Journal of Teacher Education, Spring, 1970, pp. 15-21.

[2] Howsam, op. cit., pp. 13, 14.

[3] Dale Bolton, Selection and Evaluation of Teachers. Berkeley: McCutchen Publishing Co., 1973, pp. 100, 101.

improvement of group and individual performance; that is, the increasingly effective attainment of the ultimate goal, student growth toward desired ends. Koob and Shaw identify as the central justification for Catholic schools that the pupil will not only learn about but also learn to live Christianity.[1] The fostering of this objective must take precedence over administrative purposes such as the selection, retention or dismissal of teachers, or the defense of a budget. The administrative process does not exist for its own sake; it exists to serve the education of children. Thus the overriding purpose of evaluation programs must be to safeguard and improve the quality of instruction received by students. In keeping with this principle, we attempted to incorporate in the instrument those criteria of teacher effectivensss which appear to have the strongest research evidence supporting their relevance to pupil achievement.

Since teacher evaluation is so controversial, it may be interesting to know that a survey of school principals revealed that they believed teachers would accept and welcome evaluation if the major focus of the evaluation were upon improving instruction rather than on fault finding.[2] This seemed to be true of the teachers in the Archdiocese of Washington. By repeated emphasis upon the importance of school improvement, and of self-awareness for personal improvement, the cooperation of teachers was secured. This is evident from the fact that 60 percent of the 1,500 teachers in the Archdiocese responded with comments and critiques of a preliminary draft of the instrument.

---

[1] Koob and Shaw, op. cit., p. 22.

[2] Gale W. Rose, "The Effects of Administrative Evaluation," The National Elementary School Principal, November, 1963, p. 51.

Planning the Evaluation Process

When planning an evaluation process, one confronts the question, "Who should evaluate?" Although surveys cannot establish what should be done, the results of a recent survey of evaluation practices by the National Education Association indicated that in 234 school systems surveyed, only 17 systems had no formal procedures for evaluating teachers. In more than half of the school systems, the N.E.A. found that the principal is the sole evaluator. Furthermore, this situation is apparently satisfactory to the teachers since 97 percent of them believe that the principal should do the evaluation. At the same time, 93 percent of the teachers believe that the primary purpose of evaluation should be the improvement of instruction.[1] In a still more recent survey, 77 out of 108 systems reported that the principal is the sole evaluator responsible for completing the final evaluation form, although in many systems he solicits the opinions of others such as assistant principals, supervisors, and department heads. A few systems use multiple evaluators, and in only one system were teachers used in the evaluation of other teachers.[2] Jerry Herman and Staynor Brighton have developed an excellent analysis of the pros and cons of evaluation by the various persons and groups who are likely to be involved in the process.

---

[1] "Evaluation of Teaching Competence," NEA Research Bulletin, October, 1969, pp. 67-75.

[2] "Evaluating Teacher Performance," ERS Circular No. 2, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1972, pp. 3, 4.

Self-Evaluation. If the purpose of teacher evaluation is the improvement of instruction, self-evaluation should be one of the most meaningful aspects of the total evaluation process. The teacher shares the responsibility for improving his/her teaching performance and often regards it as the most acceptable type of evaluation and the least threatening, although the standards used might not relate readily to external criteria.

Since teacher evaluation is based upon one's accepted goals and objectives, and is aimed at self-improvement, it might be argued that no one can know the goals of the teacher better than the teacher herself. Therefore, the teacher is best able to judge the degree to which the goals are achieved. However, relatively few teachers can be truly objective. Research apparently indicates that insecure teachers tend to overrate themselves, while secure teachers tend to underrate themselves.[1] In spite of these concerns, if a teacher is going to grow and improve in the teaching process, the desire to change is critical. The most effective motivation for change in behavior is self-motivation, developing one's own level of expectations of performance, and continuously evaluating the degree to which the actual performance meets the expectations.

Peer Evaluation. Evaluation by other teachers, one's peers, seems to be very meaningful. However, there are advantages and disadvantages, as pointed out by Herman. Among the advantages are:

1. A fellow worker assigned to the same task possesses more in-depth knowledge of the requirements of the specific assignment than any other individual. Who might better judge a reading specialist than another reading specialist?

---

[1] Brighton, op. cit., p. 25; Jerry L. Herman, Developing an Effective School Staff Evaluation Program, West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Co., 1973, p. 42.

2. A fellow worker is best equipped to provide an objective analysis of strengths and weaknesses, and he is also best able to provide detailed assistance in overcoming the weaknesses that have been located.

3. A camaraderie exists between co-workers that makes the evaluation process less threatening, and this fact puts the person being evaluated more at ease.

4. A peer evaluation system produces better morale throughout the entire employee group because peers are placed in a helpful relationship.

On the other hand, Herman suggested these disadvantages associated with peer evaluation:

1. The peer evaluator may be myopic in vision; therefore, he may not understand the total school system's needs. This could cause some very important information to be completely missed.

2. The peer evaluator is placed in the unfair position of evaluator when he has no authority or responsibility to make judgments about the quantity or quality of a fellow worker's production level. This responsibility is an administrator's function.

3. The peer evaluator will not be objective in his evaluation since he is a member of the same employee group. The tendency is to whitewash all employees perhaps in the hope that by being "nice" to the other fellow, he will be "easy on me."

4. The peer evaluation may conflict with that of the immediate administrative supervisor who has to make recommendations as to hiring, firing and promotion.

5. A peer evaluation could lead to resentment of a co-worker by the evaluatee if the evaluation is not favorable, thus leading to intra-group conflict.

6. Peer evaluators could be very costly when the amount of released time from the prime duties of the evaluators is computed.

To this list by Herman, Staynor Brighton adds the notion that teachers vary widely in their ability to evaluate. Some, he points out, are critical by nature, and others tend to praise everyone. Thus,

peer evaluations certainly do not represent comparable or consistent results.[1]

Administrator Evaluation. Surveys indicate that administrators, particularly school principals, are the persons most generally responsible for evaluation. On the positive side, some advantages are:

1. Presumably, training and job assignment make this person the best qualified to conduct teacher evaluation.
2. This person has day-to-day responsibility and must evaluate if he is to be held accountable.
3. This person has the greatest number of day-to-day contacts with all staff members and should be best able to provide valid, unbiased evaluations.
4. Evaluations by this person will have more impact than that of any other single evaluator.

On the negative side, evaluation by the principal has the following disadvantages:

(1) The principal's image interferes with the objectivity of the evaluation process; teachers apparently fear this loss of objectivity.

(2) The principal often has not taught in the classroom for many years and may not be able to make an evaluation based upon current knowledge or methodology.

(3) Many principals simply do not have the range of knowledge necessary to evaluate teachers in diverse areas such as art, music, physical education, mathematics, English.

(4) The principal often fears loss of respect or staff morale problems if he is candid in his evaluations. Concern for acceptance by the staff may prevent the making of genuinely honest evaluations.[2]

---

[1] Herman, op. cit., p. 40; Brighton, op. cit., pp. 22-25.

[2] Herman, op. cit., pp. 48, 49; Brighton, op. cit., pp. 19-22.

Student Evaluation. In recent years, considerable emphasis has been placed upon student evaluation of teachers. Again, there is a certain logical appeal to the notion that teaching should be evaluated by the consumer, that is, the student. On the positive side of student evaluation, we may note the following:

1. Students are in daily contact with teachers and thus have the best basis on which to make judgments not only of individual teachers, but comparative judgments between different teachers.

2. Student evaluation greatly increases the number of evaluators without greatly increasing the dollar cost of the process.

Many teachers, while willing that students be consulted, are reluctant to place heavy dependence upon student evaluation. Some of the reasons offered are:

1. Students may tend to evaluate teachers unfavorably for reasons that have nothing to do with teaching effectiveness, such as heavy loads of work, low grades, or teaching required subjects considered boring by students.

2. One student may influence several other students, so that the various evaluations are not necessarily independent.

3. Many persons feel that students are simply too immature and are not sufficiently knowledgeable about what is good for them to be able to make evaluations during the student stage of their lives.

Research on student evaluation suggests that some fares described above are not justified. There is, for example, little relationship between difficulty of course, or grade average in the course, and student evaluation of the teacher. Furthermore, there is a high correlation between student evaluations while in school and evaluations ten years later after those students leave school and become more mature. Research does, however, show that the frame of reference used

by students in making their evaluations is not consistent or constant. In fact, most instruments for student evaluation do not really make clear what is the frame of reference. Thus, the interpretation of student evaluations is likely to be ambiguous.[1]

To put the question of who should evaluate in still another perspective, I mention research by McCall in 1952. He was concerned with measures that would prove useful in merit rating of teachers. Superior teachers were defined as those who produced the most pupil growth; poor teachers were those who produced less pupil growth. He then compared ratings done by principals and ratings done by teachers with these definitions as objectively measured. McCall found that "principals tended to call good teachers poor and poor teachers good. . . . The rating of a teaching by her peers showed an index of validity of - 11 percent. In short, there is a tendency for every adult associated with teachers professionally to misjudge the teachers."[2]

What should one conclude from these various considerations? First, it is obvious that there are good reasons for involving administrators, teachers, students, and self in the evaluation process. Second, the base for evaluation should be broadened rather than being limited to a single source of evaluation. Third, the assumptions, biases, interests, frame of reference, and competence of all these potential evaluators should be carefully examined and identified.

---

[1] Herman, op. cit., pp. 41, 42; Anthony F. Grasha, "Evaluating Teaching: Some Problems," University of Cincinnati, Institute for Research and Training in Higher Education, 1972, pp. 3, 4. ED 074 532.

[2] H.H. Remmers, "Rating Methods in Research in Teaching," in N.L. Gage (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963, p. 366.

Critical Issues

James Popham, in a paper designed to assist the State of California in complying with a recent bill requiring the development of teacher evaluation systems, observed: The truth is that different teachers can employ markedly different techniques, yet achieve identical results. . . . We just don't know how to isolate the constituent elements of appropriate control procedures and effective learning environment strategies."[1] Essentially, this is the problem of individual differences which are so important to preserve in our society. Does a single system of teacher evaluation imply the reduction of differences between individual teachers? Does a single system of teaching meet equally well the learning needs of all types of learners in the school?

A second critical problem, one which is described perhaps most clearly by Barak Rosenshine and Norma Furst, is the "lack of research and accompanying use of a priori criteria" for evaluating. Every check list for rating teachers reflects certain a priori assumptions about what constitutes effective teaching. Different assumptions are made by different people, who for various reasons ranging from personal preference to recollections as to how they were taught, value different constellations of teaching behaviors. Rosenshine and Furst illustrate the results of different assumptions by citing the Northwest Regional Laboratory which has a training program using Flanders' Interaction Analysis. This system of analysis encourages teacher repetition of student answers as the preferred method of indirect teaching. However,

---

[1] Popham, op. cit., p. 32.

the Far West Regional Laboratory used Minicourse I to train teachers to repeat student answers less often! Thus, different a priori assumptions can actually lead to opposite performance criteria for the teacher.[1]

Popham has also discussed this problem, and noted that even in presumably neutral instruments, the value system of the evaluator is involved and imposed upon teachers without ever having been explicitly defined.[2] James J. Neujahr noted that "different people give different weights to such goals as creativity, subject matter competence, good attitude toward school, teacher, learning, and self. . ." and that this lack of agreement on the relative importance of educational goals confounds the problem of teacher evaluation.[3]

Finally, the overriding problem in teacher evaluation is that of identifying truly valid measures of effective teaching which are demonstrably related to the achievement of the goals and objectives of the school. Traditional or folk wisdom has produced many lists of desired teacher traits, desirable teacher behaviors, desirable teaching methods. All these may seem logically self-evident, but the research literature to date indicates only very weak links, if any at

---

[1] Barak Rosenshine and Norma Furst, "Research on Teacher Performance Criteria," in B.O. Smith (ed.), Research in Teacher Education, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1971, p. 40.

[2] W. James Popham, "The Performance Test: A New Approach to the Assessment of Teaching Proficiency," Journal of Teacher Education, Summer, 1968, pp. 216-222.

[3] James J. Neujahr, "Classroom Observational Research," The Educational Forum, January, 1972, p. 227.

all, between these traits and behaviors on the one hand and pupil outcomes on the other hand. Until this situation becomes clarified through further research, any system of teacher evaluation must be viewed as tentative.

Roles and Structures for Contemporary Catholic Education

by

Rev. Mr. Peter Stravinskas

"Overlapping roles, lack of formal structures, hazy lines of authority. Oddly enough, that description fits not post-conciliar Catholicism as much as it does contemporary Catholic education in many areas. And this situation seems to have existed, even in the "old days." Just who does "run the show"? Or, more to the point, who should run the show? In spite of the fact that Vatican II brought us to a less legalistic understanding of the Church, we have come to see that true freedom, progress and accomplishment rarely occur unless they are facilitated - by clear roles and useful structures. Obviously, we do not want structures for their own sake, but only to bring about the desired effect.

In this article I shall consider what I believe to be helpful ways of perceiving the various roles in a Catholic school, as well as some procedures, structures and methods. These suggestions are merely that, suggestions. They are based on personal reflection and observation and so are limited in many ways by my own context. The reader may also have to substitute language appropriate to his/her own local situation (e.g., inter-parochial elementary school, diocesan high school, regional high school, etc.).

Mr. Stravinskas is Spiritual Director and Chairman of the Religion Department of Bishop Kelly High School in Boise, Idaho.

The Pastor

I remember the pastor (when I was in kindergarten) as the man who scolded us for making too much noise outside his office during recess. He also came by a few days later to give us the afternoon off (to Sister's surprise?), to make friends again. Finally, he gave out the report cards each term.

In a world where everything is so planned, there is a certain charm and humanness about the spontaneity of a surprise "day off." But I cannot help wondering how many principals were quite annoyed by Father's lack of consultation. Is this good communication? Is this good administration? I think not. As we move away from regarding the pastor as a minor monarch, we see the need for even the pastor to operate within some clearly defined parameters.

The pastor should ask, then, "How can I best serve this school?" The most important contribution the pastor can make is by providing a positive attitude. He must be absolutely convinced of the value of Catholic education; he should believe that the overall effectiveness and mission of the parish would be less successful if the school did not exist. And he should say this not just at PTA meetings or faculty meetings, but from the pulpit - and not just during "Catholic Schools Week." It would also be refreshing to hear two other points: first, that it is a serious obligation for parents to send their children to a Catholic school (or don't we believe this anymore?); second, that the parish school is the responsibility of the entire parish community, not simply the parents of Catholic school students.

No bishop or personnel board should assign a pastor to a parish with a school unless he indicates a real commitment to the maintenance of

quality Catholic education. Some may think I place too much of a burden on the pastor but the pastor, in many ways, can make or break a school. I know one pastor who, by his personal attitude, was able to raise $35,000 in four weeks for a new school boiler - in an inner-city parish. I also know a pastor who, in two years' time, so demoralized faculty and parents that a school with an enrollment of 800 dwindled to 200.

Since the pastor has the task of integrating all parish activities, he will have to insert the school into the general framework: how will this school advance our goals? Because he has his finger on the pulse of the parish, he knows the needs of the people which the school can satisfy: spiritual, cultural, ethnic. His guidance, input and cooperation are essential.

As things now stand, whether we like it or not, the pastor must still be the "money man." He has to know how to raise money, provide for all ordinary expenses in a budget and then hand over the reins to the principal. This last point may have caused some eyebrows to be raised, but I firmly believe that the dispenser of budgeted expenses should be the principal and not the pastor. When I said this to a pastor recently, he said, "Oh, I get it. I raise the money and she spends it." And why not? If the budget has been carefully worked out and if the principal is a competent person, there should be no problems. So often fears of having the principal handle finances is simply a left-over from the days when it was assumed that Sister could not (or should not) be involved with money. By the same token, Sister should also be concerned about fund-raising.

With his parish council and/or board of education, the pastor will have to determine what percentage of parish funds will subsidize the

school and how much will have to be borne by tuition. Just a word of caution: we may be "tuitioning" ourselves out of business. There are other ways of raising the necessary funds.

Many pastors unintentionally create a division in the faculty by referring to "our Sisters and lay teachers." It's a small point, but "our faculty" would do. Many lay teachers feel like "appendages" or "second string" players and some sensitivity on this matter could go a long way.

What about direct involvement with the children? If the pastor (or the other priests) are qualified for and disposed toward teaching, their talents should be utilized. But, if they are not competent or willing, the result is often disastrous. The pastor should feel "at home" in the school, visit the classes (maybe checking with the teacher in advance to determine if testing, etc. might be going on) and play with the children at recess or lunch periods. It really defeats the purpose of a parish school if the only time the children see the priest is in church. The faculty should also feel comfortable enough with the pastor to be able to come to him with any personal problems - an aspect we often neglect.

In some areas, where a regional school has been formed, a board of pastors (from the "sending parishes") has been established. In addition to serving as a "board of directors," these men have two vital tasks to perform. First, they should represent their people, with their specific needs and wants. Second, they should serve as the school's public relations officers back in their parishes by informing their people of the programs and advantages of the school and by encouraging them to enroll their children.

In summary, the pastor is a director, a project manager, a financier, and a "PR" man.

The Principal

Much of what is said here is based on the assumption that, in the vast majority of cases, the principal is a female religious. She is in her position because she is a qualified professional woman who wants to be there and has not grudgingly accepted the assignment out of obedience. Therefore, she is the competent authority on all school matters and while the pastor should make suggestions and deserves to be heard, he should have no "veto power" in strictly academic affairs.

The principal and pastor should ideally be on the same wave length; minimally, they should be in communication with each other, they should at least understand each other and should have worked out some sort of modus operandi. Of course, the principal must be in touch with the people; she must know her faculty and have their respect - as a principal, not only as a nun.

A problem that frequently comes up is that a principal often (and very naturally) discusses school matters and faculty meeting agendas in the convent. Once the whole faculty assembles, the lay teachers are getting the information for the first time while the Sisters already know it and have often decided on how to vote. This once more makes lay teachers feel "out of it" and resentful. In faculties which have a substantial percentage of religious (and some still do!) lay teachers can be voted down by a "religious bloc." Of course, this is hardly ever intended by the principal, but the only way to avoid it is by avoiding "shop talk" at home.

I wonder how many Catholic school principals have considered attending local school board meetings. Why bother? To learn what is going on, to provide another approach to the solution of a problem, to gain a hearing for our own needs. I know of one Sister who went to such a meeting; the sight of a nun threw some into panic. Such behavior from so-called "liberals" gives us an insight into the real reasons why our rights are being disregarded: fear, bigotry, misunderstanding. By the end of the session, Sister's professionalism, dedication and resourcefulness had impressed everyone and this ultimately benefited the parish school in many concrete ways.

Much else could be said but particulars have to be worked out at the local level. Furthermore, it is to be hoped that as more and more principals are actually hired for specific schools, many problems will be eliminated, ipso facto.

Religious Teachers

Although individual contracting should not be viewed as a panacea, it is helpful. Where religious communities do not allow complete individual contracting, I would encourage religious - and pastors - to petition the major superiors to permit their Sisters to contract on a personal basis, at least within the number of schools staffed by that particular community. That means that when a vacancy occurs, all Sisters are notified, all are eligible to apply and the decision rests with the principal, pastor and parish board of education - based on the Sister's qualifications and a personal interview.

A frequent complaint of priests and people in recent years is that the Sisters are not active in the parish. In many cases, this inactivity

is a reaction to "pre-contract" day abuses but Sisters should recall that contracts usually set the minimum, not the maximum; they say what must be done, not what you may do besides. As Sisters become more conscious of their role as genuine ministers, they should feel "called" to deepen their involvement in parish life. "We already do a lot of by working in the school." Absolutely! But on the other hand, that is your job. Most of the laity hold down full-time jobs and work for the parish in their spare time - a point we clergy and religious should often ponder. By seeing Sisters active in a variety of circumstances, I think this will make religious life more attractive to young girls and will also enhance the reputation of the school.

A counter point often raised to the above is that a Sister's primary focus is the convent, not the parish. I must admit I was very shocked to read the new constitution of a community which indicated that the norm for them was a convent Mass and not a parish Mass. Although I have great problems with such a notion, this is the type of situation which must be dealt with through dialogue. If a parish is content with "school Sisters," fine; otherwise, something will have to give. And, it is only fair for the Sisters to communicate their personal policy to the pastor and parish council before becoming involved with the parish.

A final suggestion would be to become associated with professional educational organizations, especially at the state level. Although we all know that many of the teacher conventions have little to offer, I have always considered it worthwhile to participate for the sake of visibility - to remind the public school educators that we do exist, that we are professionally inclined and that we are a force to reckon with.

Lay Teachers

The "teacher surplus" of the past few years, as well as teacher dissatisfaction with public education, has provided the Catholic school system with a broad field of choice for lay teachers. Vatican II has made us appreciate the lay apostolate. However, lay teachers still have three main areas of contention: (1) they are still "second class" citizens on Catholic school faculties; (2) the Church's commitment to a living wage must only be in encyclicals or for secular enterprises; (3) they do not yet have any real opportunity for advancement. It will do no good to simply deny the charges; the only way to eliminate the charges is to change the situations mentioned above - if not the sake of justice, then for the sake of practicality: our faculties are becoming more and more lay, some even exclusively lay. We must be ready for the transition into a new era in Catholic education when a Sister may be the exception, rather than the rule.

More men are needed in our schools. In my entire elementary and secondary school education, I had four male teachers (and all in high school) and although I do not think this harmed me, some parents raise this issue and see it as a negative point. But, if our salaries go up, more men will be able to become involved.

Like the religious teachers, they should be active in professional organizations. They should also be promoters of the school in the community and among their fellow teachers in the public school system. Perhaps the best way of saying they believe in Catholic education would be to have their own children enrolled in a Catholic school and, although I would not make this a prior condition for employment, I would strongly suggest it. And, if they do have children in our schools, how about a considerably reduced rate of tuition?

Finally, but most important of all, our lay teachers must be good Christians - anything less than that is incongruous. We are not just interested in a good math teacher but in one who is a living testimony to the philosophy of the school. If we hire teachers solely on professional qualifications, soon our very raison d'etre will be undermined and eventually destroyed. Our task is not to duplicate public education but to transcend it and we do that by a totally convinced and dedicated faculty.

Parents

Parental involvement has greatly increased in the past decade as they provide input, share their talents and resources.

Many schools have adopted "work contracts" and have found them most successful. Not only is this a way of keeping tuition down and getting important work done at the same time, but administrators have noticed a great rise in parental interest because they actually participate in the life of the school.

Akin to this is the suggestion to encourage parents to visit the school at will and to feel free to approach the principal or teachers with ease. This stresses emphatically that "this is your school! You are not just tolerated; you are welcome and wanted." This type of official policy has concrete results in two ways: student performance usually increases and parental support is multiplied many times.

A crucial task today is to inform our parents of their civil rights, to encourage them to vote for candidates sympathetic to those rights and to vocalize our position openly and without fear. If the fight for equal rights for parochial school children is ever to be won, it will be the parents, and not the bishops, who will do it. We can learn much

from our Jewish friends who, though a tiny minority, have consistently been able to gain support for their causes because they are united and organized. Unity and organization are the keys for us as well.

Students

Catholic education has often suffered from a "bad press" or no press at all. Therefore, we should concentrate on "PR" by publicizing the accomplishments of our students and by advertising forthcoming events in local papers and radio stations. Many of our schools have programs which are truly innovative and creative, putting public school programs to shame, but no one outside the school ever learns of them. If we want to keep up or boost enrollment, we have to show off our products - our students.

I have always been a firm believer in discovering student opinion - not that this is our sole concern for policy formation, but it is an important one. We always hear comments unofficially but I would like to suggest September and June as two times when we do so officially through a survey (obviously at the appropriate grade level) which would ask: How can we best serve you? How have we failed you in the past? How have we succeeded?

Nor can we just assume that we know what they want; we must ask. A situation comes to mind of two high schools staffed by a community of Sisters who were going to optional habits. The Sisters of School A "assumed" that they could relate better to the students without habits and that liberated teenagers would prefer this. So, off came the habits. The Sisters of School B "asked" the students, and an 80 percent majority favored the habit. So, the habits stayed on. The Sisters of

School A then "asked" about the matter and found a similar majority in favor of habits. (Habits stayed off, however!) A small, maybe insignificant example of communication, but an indication of the need to allow our students the opportunity to grow in the knowledge of decision-making. This will not only prepare them for civil duties but for life in the Church of the future where their opinions will set priorities and establish policy.

Boards of Education

A Catholic school board of education is becoming more of a necessity every day. One of its greatest accomplishments could be to serve as a special interest group or liaison with the parish council and the local public school authorities. With the parish council, because parents of school age children hardly ever represent more than 50 percent of a parish and Catholic school parents, decidedly less. Therefore, the role of the school board would be to safeguard the interests of the school and to save it from unwarranted and dangerous budget cuts. However, in dealings with the council, it should not simply take a defensive posture. On the contrary, if the board is doing its job well, a defensive posture will never be needed.

It has often been asserted that Catholic schools are the puppets of the hierarchy and that is why I suggest the board as the structure best suited to deal with public school officials. Their task would be to represent the school's interests and to determine the kinds of programs for which our children are eligible: driver education, vocational education, transportation, health and guidance services, remedial subjects, special trips, etc. The same work could be done by the pastor

or principal but "hierophobia" tends to set in and our purposes are often defeated.

Preeminently, of course, a board of education is the source of policy. Therefore, they should produce a school handbook in consultation with the principal, pastor and faculty which outlines such matters as: constituency of the student body (only parishioners? only Catholics? only Christians? open to all?), tuition (per child? per family? for non-parishioners? for non-Catholics?), school uniform, general norms for academics and discipline.

What About. . .?

A regional association of parochial schools in collaboration with the secondary school which most students later attend, for purposes of coordination of effort and curriculum development.

Developing relationships with other denominational schools for academic reasons but also to stimulate and encourage ecumenism.

A diocesan school board with representation from the religious communities and the regional associations to form diocesan policy (especially in regard to tuition limits, openings, closings, etc.), to serve as a resource for the establishment of parish boards of education, to function as a liaison with the Diocesan Pastoral Council, Priests' Senate and Sisters' Senate, to be an advisory body for the Bishop.

The parish school as a resource center and hub of activity for the parish and broader community. In addition to providing an often needed service, this builds good will.

A financial secretary to handle tuition bills and delinquent payers. This removes the Church from the position of a mercenary

collection agency.

A system of scholarships at the diocesan and parochial level for needy youngsters. Otherwise, our schools may well become the exclusive preserve of the elite.

The establishment of relationships with local colleges. Often their students can serve as teacher aids or tutors: a benefit to the college student but also an opportunity for him to see Catholic education first hand. It could make him consider teaching in our system or at least make for one more citizen informed about and responsive to Catholic education.

Central purchasing of books and other materials through a diocesan agency. The savings can be phenomenal.

Diocesan funding or equal assessment. Many pastors have pushed to close their schools because of the financial burden. If all parishes were equally assessed for the total cost of Catholic education in a diocese and all expenses were then assumed by the diocese, this would reduce the likelihood of a pastor (or parish council) agitating to close a school. This would also be a tremendous aid to the continued existence of inner-city schools. Most importantly, it would emphasize the fact tnat Catholic education is a concern of the whole diocese, not just of parishes which have schools or of parents whose children are in those schools.

What has been said here will receive very different reactions. Some proposals may appeal; others will not. But all o. them are based on the assumption that our schools are here to stay. The question before us is: in what condition? If some creative thinking is sparked and if some of these guidelines and suggestions are implemented, the future looks very bright.

Contracts in Educational Ministry

by

Joseph Clayton Neiman

With Spring in the educational calendar comes the process of evaluation. The students, the programs, and the teaching personnel are scrutinized in order to plan extensions or changes for the coming academic year. While tests, questionnaires, and such are used for student and program evaluation, contract deliberations are the typical process for the evaluation of present and/or the selection of new personnel.

Religious educators, however, tend to resist signing employment contracts with a local Church feeling that such business matters are inappropriate in a Christian community. If contracts are simply routine business documents and if contract deliberations are actually negotiations wherein each party divests the other of some power or service, then such resistance is very necessary. On the other hand, if contracts can be seen in a covenant perspective, then contract deliberations can provide an opportunity for real growth in the Christian community.

What Is a Contract?

Legally a contract is a promise between two persons enforceable by law. Usually it is the result of a bargaining process in which one person (individual or corporate) agrees to give the one(s) making the promise something in exchange. That which is exchanged may be property, money, service or something similar. If person A promises something to person B, but B gives nothing in

---

Mr. Neiman is a writer concerned chiefly with religious news and views and the educational work of churches.

return, the contract is termed unilateral. If both A and B promise something to one another, the contract is termed bilateral. The making of a contract requires mutual assent by both persons (parties). What is offered by one or both is stated in the terms of the contract as an expression of the promise by the parties to fulfill the exchange. Assenting to the terms of the contract means assenting to the exchange. In law only the reasonable understanding created by the terms of the contract is enforceable and not the subjective intentions of the parties. In enforcing a contract the law seeks to effect the original intention of the contracting parties by ensuring that the exchange is made or that reparation for the broken promise is given.

Contracts are the subject of a great deal of contemporary jurisprudence (law making and interpreting) mainly because we have such an elaborate system of credit or economic exchange. Contract law, however, is a rather recent development in civil jurisprudence. From the collapse of the Roman Empire up until rather modern times, the Church was the main source of contract "jurisprudence" since in essence a contract is an obligation created and determined by the will of the parties involved and hence a moral matter.

Until the development of elaborate systems of credit, therefore, contracts were a personal, familial, or political matter under religious sanction. The promises were expressed orally and sealed with an oath and/or a handshake. Some were expressed in writing and formalized with the seal of the parties. Both were generally made before witnesses who could testify throughout their life as to the nature and the circumstances of the promises.

If a contract were broken, the individual exacted payment - often harshly as St. Matthew's Gospel depicts (18:34) - or the family began a feud to seek reparation. If such private means failed, the suffering party

sought justice in the court of the chancery of the Church. An adverse judgment might mean excommunication for the guilty person which effectively cut him off from organized society: political, economic and religious.

The chancery courts employed clerics educated in canon law. These clerics are part of the forefathers of the legal profession. Many a young man sought tonsure as a cleric without ordination in order to become educated thus securing "professional status" and yet not be subject completely to the authority of the Church.

There were frequently tensions between the courts of the chancery and the courts of the palace (which handled political agreements) over jurisdiction, revenue from court fees, and the enforcement of judgments. As the power of the state increased over that of the Church, more and more of the jurisprudence pertaining to moral matters such as contracts (like marriage) were incorporated into civil courts and legislatures. Today only a vestige of the court of the chancery remains, dealing largely with matters such as marriage and promises related to religious vocations.

Are Contracts Appropriate in the Local Church?

While we can see that historically the Church was quite involved with contracts, nevertheless the question of the appropriateness still remains particularly since we are seeking to renew the structures and processes of the Church today largely in terms of biblical research.

Contracts within the Church are not exactly legal promises enforceable by law, that is civil law. Even if courts will admit cases pertaining to broken contractual agreements in the area of employment, nevertheless this avenue for due process is highly inappropriate albeit necessary in some circumstances. The real strength binding promises within the Christian community comes not from civil jurisprudence on contracts but from theological and biblical reflection on covenants.

The Hebrew word for covenant means a binding tie between persons. As McKenzie points out, early Hebrew society had few written agreements and hence "the spoken word was invested with ritual solemnity which gave it a kind of concrete reality."[1] When such spoken agreements were formalized before witnesses, they became a covenant, that is, "a solemn ritual agreement which served the function of a written contract." Strong blessings and curses flowed from the keeping or breaking of such covenanted relationships.

The constitutive elements of biblical covenants include the following: (1) the parties to the agreement; (2) the stipulations of the agreement; (3) the oaths and blessings and curses; and (4) a ritual enactment. Examples of Old Testament covenants include political alliances: (Gen. 14:13; Jos. 9:15); settling of disputes (Gen. 21:31; 26:38); and friendship bonds such as that between David and Jonathan (1 Sm. 18:3).

The predominant understanding of covenant within the Bible and the Christian community, however, is that theological expression meant to explain God's relationship with His people. In the Old Testament it is the Sinai covenant (Ex. 19) between Yahweh and Israel; in the New Testament it is the eucharistic covenant (Mt. 26:28) between Christ and His disciples (Church). The principle covenant form upon which the Bible builds is the treaty pattern used by the ancient Hittites. Their treaties were of two kinds: (1) the suzerainty treaty between unequal parties such as a king and his vassals; and (2) parity treaties between

---

[1] John L. McKenzie, "Covenant," Dictionary of the Bible. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1965).

equals. Suzerainty treaties were mainly unilateral whereas parity treaties were bilateral, that is, both equal parties exchanged something in order to make the contract valid.

The covenanted relationship portrayed between God and His people is unilateral since the parties were unequal and since the offer originated freely with God. To say that the covenant is unilateral, however, does not imply that God does nothing. The Scriptures clearly show that God saves His people and continually remains faithful to them even when they do not fulfill their promises. The covenant is also unilateral in the sense that there was (is) nothing which Israel (or Jesus' disciples) could do to initiate such a relationship nor to make the exchange of equal value.

Covenants, therefore, play a large role in the Christian community's self-understanding. Thus, ties between persons which are seen as covenants are much stronger than promises formalized into civil contracts binding in law. Hence, covenant theology provides a much stronger frame of reference for understanding contracts in educational ministry.

Contracts in Educational Ministry

In light of the above, contracts in the local Church should be viewed as incarnate expressions of the call and the commissioning to ministry in the educational mission. (I use the term, "educational mission," to denote the answer which the local Church gives to the question: What should we do in education?) Beneath the economic format the Christian community is entering into a covenanted relationship with one whom the Spirit has given a charism for teaching (See I Cor. 12). This reality has a number of implications for contract deliberations including, it seems to me, the following:

First of all contract deliberations and documents should reflect a tone of educational ministry rather than economic stipulations alone. Contracts between parishes and educational ministers, for example, have little legal value anyway and hence they need not follow a tight legal format. Discussions should be in a spirit of prayerful deliberation about the educational mission of the local Church and the contributions which this person can make. This need not mean that the discussions and the documents (contracts, supplements, descriptions, etc.) should be unreasonably vague. Both civil jurisprudence and biblical theology would teach us that the stipulations of contracts or covenants should be stated clearly albeit in broad terms. Civil contracts tend to fail most frequently where the parties exp ess themselves obscurely, where they leave large parts of their intentions unexpressed, or where they have subjective intentions which are contrary to what is expressed in the terms of the agreement. "You shall not kill" (Ex. 20:13) is quite clear even though the implications of this covenant stipulation in all aspects of life are left unstated.

Secondly, both the local Church and the educational minister (director of religious education, principal, teacher, etc.) should realize that the contract is a unilateral agreement parallel with the biblical covenant. The Christian community and the educational minister are not equal parties exchanging something which effects the contract. There is nothing the teacher can do, for example, to become worthy to teach the Gospel. The charism for teaching is given freely by the Spirit and is not the direct result of a degree program however designed. As Paul puts it: "No one can confess 'Jesus is Lord' unless he is guided by the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:3). Furthermore, the Christian

community is not being magnanimous in paying a teacher for indeed "the Lord has directed that those who preach the Gospel should get their living from it" (1 Cor. 9:14).

Thirdly, realizing that the contract is a unilateral covenant between the Christian community and the minister of the Gospel should bring both parties to a deeper awareness of the demands of fidelity which signing this symbolic document expresses. Both must realize, for example, that the Christian community is founded upon the cornerstone of Jesus Christ and is not a creation of man built around either a Church dogma or a theological theory. "We are simply God's servants" (1 Cor. 3:5). Hence, whatever either the local Church or the teacher does must be done "in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Col. 3:17). As Paul says, "There are different ways of serving but the same Lord is served" (1 Cor. 12:5).

In addition to the joint demands which the Gospel makes upon both, there are unique demands for each. The local Church must be faithful to the minister of the Word much like Yahweh with Israel as Hosea would teach us: supporting, sustaining, bearing patiently, and listening to the voice of the Spirit which may come through this person whom the Spirit has endowed with spiritual gifts. The local Church, therefore, must not "play with" educational ministers keeping them around for token tasks until they are no longer needed. Rather a genuine sharing of the ministry of teaching the Gospel must be part of the commissioning in the contract.

On the other hand, the teacher (or principal or DRE) must also realize that the charism of teaching is freely given by the Spirit for the building up of the brotherhood of believers. Therefore, it is the

Community - not the professional, nor the diocesan (district) office, nor an organization - which discerns whether the charism is for the good of all. "Since you are eager to have the gifts of the Spirit," Paul admonishes, "above everything else you must try to make greater use of those which help build up the Church" (1 Cor. 14:12). In practical terms this demands a prayerful effort to discern which of the ideas and programs proposed are of "God's wisdom" and for the benefit of the Community; and which are of "man's wisdom" and incapable of teaching spiritual truths.

Lastly, it would seem that understanding contracts in the local Church as covenanted relationships would necessitate ritual enactment rather than mere routine signing. When the Church and the DRE, for example, have come to a consensus about the contract, then a public liturgical celebration would be most appropriate. This celebration would emphasize: (1) the basic responsibility of all believers for communicating the Gospel through a symbolic endorsement of the responsibilities of parents and communal bodies such as educational boards and committees; and (2) the special commissioning of the various persons who have been called to share their teaching charism within the community in more formal ways.

In sum contracts are indeed an important part of educational ministry and contract deliberations provide a good opportunity for the local Church and the teaching personnel to grow spiritually mature in the "hidden wisdom of God" (1 Cor. 2:7). I realize that this sounds idyllic but it seems to me that only a clear ideal such as this can help us sort through the tangle of words in contracts, job descriptions, and contract deliberations. Unless this ideal is incarnate somehow,

is the educational enterprise Christian?

Bibliography

Ernst Kasemann, "Ministry and Community in the New Testament," Essays on New Testament Themes (London: SCM Press, 1964).

John L. McKenzie, "Aspects of Old Testament Thought," Jerome Biblical Commentary (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968).

Hans Kung, "The Charismatic Structure of the Church," The Church and Ecumenism, Concilium Vol. 4 (New York: Paulist, 1965).

W. J. Reader, Professional Men: The Rise of the Professional Classes in Nineteenth Century England (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1966).

Richard Wincor, The Law of Contracts (New York: Oceana Publishers, 1970).

(Sample "contract" for use in a ritual enactment in the local Church)

Educational Service Contract

We, the Pastor and People of _____ Church, recognizing our mandate to "Go to the whole world and proclaim the Good News to all creation: (Mark 15:16), hereby call and commission _____(name)_____ to assist us in fulfilling our educational mission as ___(e.g., Director of Education)___.

We commission you to share the gifts of teaching the Gospel which the Spirit of Christ has given you and to assist us with our communal mandate by fulfilling the responsibilities described in Supplement A attached herewith. We implore you to be "careful always to choose the right course; to be brave under trials; and to make the preaching of the Good News your life's work, in thoroughgoing service" (2 Timothy 4:5).

Recognizing that "the Lord has directed that those who preach the Gospel should get their living from it" (1 Cor. 9:14), we pledge our support and cooperation in the manner described in Supplement B also attached herewith.

We reserve the right to discern whether the gifts which you share are for "the common good" (1 Cor. 14:16) recognizing at the same time that "there are many gifts but always the same Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:4) and that we are both called to be faithful to the "Good News of Christ" which we have all received and which can never be changed (Gal. 1:6-9).

In all our efforts together we seek to grow spiritually mature by "remaining faithful to the teachings of the apostles, to the brotherhood, to the breaking of the bread, and to the prayers" (Acts 2:42). In this way we can fulfill our mandate of "making disciples of all nations" (Matt. 28:19).

In witness whereof on this the _____ in the year of Our Lord _____, we affix our names:

Pastor _____

President, Board of Education _____

Educational Minister _____

The Superintendent's Search Became a 90-Day Wonder

by

James E. Holthaus

When we began, we needed a Superintendent of Schools. Within 90 days we had established a search committee, announced the vacancy throughout the country, developed specific evaluation criteria, screened 39 applicants' resumes and references, interviewed a selected group, tabulated our evaluation scores and recommended the committee's choice to the School Board. The job of the Search Committee was over and the experience was enriching for all who participated. There is a saying, "You can only get out of an organization by measure of what you put into it." We think we even acquired more out of the committee experience than we put in - and we would like to tell you about it just in case you have occasion to travel down the same road.

The following steps were taken:

1. Establish the committee
2. Set the time table
3. Announce the vacancy
4. Develop evaluation criteria
5. Screen applicants
6. Interview applicants
7. Evaluate and recommend.

Mr. Holthaus is a member of the Baltimore Archdiocesan School Board and served as Chairman of the Search Committee for a new Superintendent.

Each of the above steps was essential toward completing our goal. We called them the 'Seven Capital Steps' without initially realizing how important ard integral each step was for selecting our Superintendent.

A discussion of each step can provide guidelines for the search committee; however, different local areas call for modified planning depending upon geographical location, size and apparent needs of the school system and restrictions on the applicants' background.

First . . . Establish the Committee

Our search committee was comprised of nine members with varied educational interests and backgrounds. There were four women and five men representing the Secretary of Education, the outgoing Superintendent, Elementary School Administrators/Teachers, Secondary School Administrators/Teachers, Urban Parochial Schools, City Public Schools, County Public Schools, the Education Committee of the Archdiocesan Pastoral Council and the School Board.

The school board member was appointed chairman of the committee. An executive secretary was chosen to coordinate all mailouts, press releases, and interviews. The executive secretary was the present Superintendent's secretary.

Second. . . Set the Timetable

The timetable was the plan, agreed upon by the Search Committee with specific milestones, for insuring that the recommendation could be made within a specified time period. Our timetable was set for 90 days and appeared as follows:

Event	Days After Go-Ahead
Search committee formed	0 - 1
Initial meeting	5
Vacancy announced (press releases)	8 - 9
Finalize superintendent job description	12
Call for applicants (press release)	15
Finalize screening procedure	40
Finalize interview procedure	40
Deadline for applicants (press release)	60
Screening of applicants	60 - 65
Interviews	70 - 71
Recommendation to school board	75
Announcement	90

Next. . . Announce the Vacancy

After the search committee was formed, subcommittees were established at the initial meeting for writing the detailed job description and announcement of the vacancy, developing evaluation criteria and organizing press releases. The vacancy was announced through press releases, advertisements in The Catholic Review, the archdiocesan weekly paper, periodicals, monthly magazines, and country-wide diocesan mailouts.

The job description or "profile" of the ideal superintendent was discussed in many ways. As Carroll F. Johnson states in "How to Select a Superintendent," American School Board Journal, November 1975, the job description could involve community participation especially if the school system involved stressed community involvement. In our case,

the Secretary of Education, the Superintendent and one committee member formulated the job description using the present job description and various sample job descriptions from other dioceses. The job description included the salary range so, as recommended in Carroll Johnson's article, the salary was not negotiable. It was not necessary to include the job description in the announcement of vacancy, but it was included in the call for applicants.

. . . Call for Applicants

Our call for applicants was a release that included a brief description of the relevant characteristics of the school system, community, and the job description of the Superintendent. It was mailed to 75 dioceses throughout the country and publicized in the local papers. The deadline for applicants was set for 45 days after the call for applicants was released.

Now. . . Develop Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation criteria was developed for two particular steps in which the committee evaluated the applicants. First, the applicants were to be screened and then the highest rated applicants would be interviewed. A subcommittee began to prepare screening and interview guidelines, whereby each applicant could be graded objectively. Each process was to involve the action of the entire search committee.

. . . The Screening Process

Each member of the committee privately reviewed each applicant's vita and references, then decided on one of three recommendations: interview, consider for interview, or do not interview. At the conclusion of the screening, the Search Committee met as a group and reviewed

each applicant again, and since there were nine committee members, the summary evaluation scoring for each applicant appeared in the following sample format:

SAMPLE SCREENING FORMAT

	Interview	Consider for Interview	Do Not Interview
Applicant #1	5	3	1
Applicant #2	3	3	3
Applicant #3	1	2	6

In a discussion period, during this meeting, a vote was taken on each applicant to interview or not to interview. As a result of this vote, the 39 applicants were narrowed down to six to be interviewed.

. . . The Interview

The interviewing was to be completed on two consecutive days. A one and a half hour interview was scheduled for each successful applicant.

Interviews were scheduled at 9:00 am, 10:45 am, and 1:15 pm on consecutive days. At 2:45 pm the committee reread each applicant's references and then graded each applicant.

The interview procedure included thirteen questions which were prepared concerning the applicant's knowledge of the particular diocese for which he/she was applying, knowledge of administration, planning, budgeting, philosophy of education, curriculum background and personal characteristics. The questions were given to each applicant five to ten minutes before the interview, and the applicant was allowed 45 minutes to comment on all questions. The remaining 45 minutes of the interview were allocated to questions from each member of the committee. (This would give the committee members further insight into the applicant's

background in the various categories in which they would be graded.)

Each member of the search committee used the following summary to grade each applicant.

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Applicant _____

Name of Search Committee Member _____

(Circle score in each category for applicants. Return all score sheets at end of day.)

Administration

1.	Understanding of Baltimore Archdiocese, roles of Supt., Sec. of Education and collegial structures within	1 2 3 4 5
2.	Understanding of workable budgets/subsidy	1 2 3 4 5
3.	Proven ability to negotiate	1 2 3 4 5
4.	Ability to plan ahead to meet the school system's problems	1 2 3 4 5
5.	Ability to organize, communicate, manage, train and evaluate personnel	2 4 6 8 10
6.	Competence in Business Management, plant operations, maintenance and transportation	1 2 3 4 5
7.	Proven leadership ability in administration	1 2 3 4 5

Academics

1.	Educational background for the Superintendent's role	1 2 3 4 5
2.	Sound philosophy of Education. "To teach as Jesus did." Aggressive about upgrading the Catholic school system.	2 4 6 8 10
3.	Demonstrated ability in curriculum development, learning process, training, teaching techniques and varied needs within the Archdiocese of Baltimore.	3 6 9 12 15

4. Ability to evaluate and utilize staff properly 1 2 3 4 5

5. Concern for insuring that students receive proper counseling, a fair grading philosophy and good testing criteria. 1 2 3 4 5

Personal Characteristics

1. Proven ability to lead and shoulder responsibilities, varied accomplishments 1 2 3 4 5

2. Strength of Character. Unquestioned courage, integrity and honesty. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Self-expression. Ability to speak and write acceptably. Ability to operate in high pressure job. 1 2 3 4 5

4. Excellent health, good judgment, common sense and perception, ability to get along with people. 1 2 3 4 5

Bonus

1. Exceptional philosophy of education and its role in life. 1 2 3 4 5

2. Outstanding organizational and administrative skills. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Exceptional communication skills 1 2 3 4 5

4. Outstanding talents. 1 2 3 4 5

. . . The Evaluation Procedure

The following summary tables were prepared for all of the applicants who were interviewed:

Search Committee Scores

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	Average
Candidate #1										
Candidate #2										
Candidate #3										
Candidate #4										
Candidate #5										
Candidate #6										

The average score was determined after eliminating the high and low score each applicant received. This was used to avoid any biased scores.

In addition, each candidate's score was averaged in the categories in the evaluation summary sheets as follows:

	Administration	Academics	Personal	Bonus
Candidate #1				
Candidate #2				
Candidate #3				
Candidate #4				
Candidate #5				
Candidate #6				

Through committee discussion of the evaluation, it was evident that one applicant was outstanding in the overall scoring both in total score and on a category basis. The result of this evaluation procedure allowed the committee to enthusiastically recommend one candidate for the Superintendent's position.

The search committee devoted in excess of 200 hours' effort in evaluating candidates from 19 states. Over 75 diocesan offices were contacted, press releases were sent to four papers and journals, and at least three mailings were sent to each applicant. Of the 39 applicants, 24 were laymen and six laywomen, six were male religious and three were female religious. Seventy percent of the candidates had received a Master's Degree in education or educational administration, while 30 percent held a doctorate in the same fields.

The search committee realized an unusual camaraderie at the completion of the 90-day period because of the sincere dedication each member had for the future of the Catholic school system throughout the Archdiocese of Baltimore. As stated in Jonathan Livingston Seagull, "It's good to be a seeker, but sooner or later you have to be a finder. And then it is well to give what you have found, a gift to the world for whoever will accept it." Our gift was our candidate whom we proposed to our School Board.